REMARKS

Claims 1 and 28-33 are pending in the present application. Claim 28 has been amended to clarify features already present in Claim 28. Applicant respectfully request entry of the amendment to Claim 28 to place Claim 28 in better condition for appeal.

Election/Restrictions

Applicant disagrees that the Species identified are mutually exclusive as indicated by the Examiner. Enclosed is a copy of the petition filed herewith in that regard. Applicant respectfully request further examination on the merits with respect to Claims 2-19 and 34-43, which were the subject of an improper restriction requirement.

Claim Rejections pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

Claim 1 stands rejected pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by European Patent Publication EP 0369434 (herein after referred to as EP '434). In addition, Claims 1, 28, 30 and 31 stand rejected pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Japanese Patent Publication JP 5-85196 (hereinafter referred to as "JP '196"). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections because the cited prior art does not teach all of the limitations of the Claims.

Claim 1

Claim 1 is directed to a method of making a woven spider that includes weaving a wrapped thread at a selected location in the cloth to serve as part of the weave of the cloth. Conversely, Figure 7C of EP '434 clearly teaches a flat net shaped woven wire (20) that is on a damper (1). EP '434 also specifically teaches that the flat net shaped woven wire "is molded to be ***adhered to*** the damper." (Col. 7 lines 32-36) (emphasis Applicant's) Further, EP '434

specifically describes with reference to Figs. 7A, 7B and 7C(sic) "a damper to which the plain weave woven wire is mounted." If something is adhered to a spider or mounted on a spider as taught in EP '434, it cannot possibly be weaved at a selected location in the cloth from which the spider is to be woven as described in Claim 1. In addition, something that is illustrated and described as mounted on top of a spider as depicted in Fig. 7C of EP ' 434 and adhered to the spider as taught by EP '434 cannot possibly serve as part of the weave of a cloth as described in Claim 1. Accordingly, EP '434 fails to teach each and every limitation described in Claim 1.

Claim 1 also describes selecting a thread of cloth from which the spider is to be woven and wrapping an electrical conductor around the thread. In sharp contrast, JP '196 teaches "flat knit gold threads" that are soldered at one end to a coil bobbin and connected an input terminal at the other end. (JP '196 translation paragraph 11 pgs. 14 and 15) The flat knit gold threads are woven into a damper made of cloth. (JP '196 translation paragraph 11 pgs. 14 and 15) Sound signals are input to a tweeter and a voice coil of a woofer through the gold threads. (JP '196 translation paragraphs 23 and 24 pages 18-19) JP '196 also teaches that a warp (S1) and weft (S2) are woven into a cloth and the flat knit gold threads are woven into the cloth. (FIG. 6, JP '196 translation paragraph 36 pg. 22 and paragraph 48 pg. 26) Clearly, all of the flat knit gold threads of JP '196 are electrical conductors and are not a thread of cloth from which a spider is to be woven as described in Claim 1.

For at least the foregoing reasons, neither EP '434 nor JP '196 teach each and every limitation described in Claim 1. Accordingly, Claim 1 is patentably distinct over the cited prior art and Applicant respectfully requests removal of the 25 USC §102(b) rejection of Claim 1.

Claim 28

Amended Claim 28 is directed to a method of making a woven spider. The method includes weaving a selected non-conducting thread that is wrapped with an electrical conductor into a woven cloth to form a single shed or course of the woven cloth that forms the woven spider. As previously discussed, EP '434 teaches that flat net shaped woven wire is mounted on a woven cloth and adhered to the woven cloth. Something that is mounted on a woven cloth cannot possibly be woven into a woven cloth, as is the non-conducting thread wrapped with an electrical conductor that is described in Claim 28. In addition, such a mounted object cannot possibly be woven into a woven cloth, to form a single shed or course of the woven cloth that forms a woven spider as also described in Claim 28.

Claim 28 also describes helically wrapping an electrical conductor around a selected non-conducting thread. Clearly, JP '196 fails to teach helically wrapping an electrical conductor around a non-conducting thread as described in Claim 28. Conversely, JP '196, teaches a plurality of gold threads that are knitted together to form an electrical conductor to carry audio signals. JP '196 also teaches that the gold threads are soldered to input terminals and a coil bobbin of a loudspeaker. Clearly a non-conducting thread cannot carry audio signals and cannot be soldered. In addition, in Claim 28, two specific and distinct limitations are described: a non-conducting thread and an electrical conductor. JP '196, on the other hand describes identical knit gold threads. A non-conducting thread and an electrical conductor as described in Claim 28 are not equivalent to identical gold threads.

Claim Rejections pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1, 28, 30, 31 and 32 also stand rejected pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious in view of JP '196 and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,091,958 to Sakamoto et al. (herein after referred to as Sakamoto). In addition, Claim 29 is rejected pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious in view of JP '196, Sakamoto and EP '434. Further, Claim 33 stands rejected pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious in view of JP '196, Sakamoto and U.S. Patent No. 3,841,952 to Kimura et al. (hereafter "Kimura"). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections because the cited prior art does not teach all of the limitations of the pending Claims.

As previously discussed, JP '196 does not teach wrapping an electrical conductor around a selected thread as described in Claim 1, nor does JP '196 teach helically wrapping an electrical conductor around a selected non-conducting thread as described in Claim 28. In the office action, it has been asserted that Sakamoto teaches these limitations. However, in Col. 3 lines 3-6, Sakamoto teaches "two tinsel cords woven flat and serving as conductors 2 are sewn in parallel into the damper raw material."

Applicant readily acknowledges that Sakamoto teaches electrical conductors, however, Applicant was unable to identify any teaching in Sakamoto that referred to wrapping an electrical conductor around a thread of cloth from which a spider is to be woven as described in Claim 1. In addition, Applicant was unable to identify any teaching in Sakamoto that referred to helically wrapping an electrical conductor around a selected non-conducting thread as described in Claim 28. In addition, as depicted in Figures 1, 2A, 3, 6 and 9-15 the conductors (2) of Sakamoto are clearly mounted on top of the damper (1) similar to EP '434 and as described in the background section of Applicant's specification.

With regard to Claim 33, Applicant readily agrees that the cream solder taught by JP '196 is a conductive adhesive. JP '196 also teaches that an outer periphery of a dustproof damper is attached by adhesives to the cone as illustrated in Fig. 1 of JP '196. (JP '196 pg. 27 paragraph 52) In addition, JP '196 teaches that the outer periphery of a coil bobbin is attached to the inner periphery of the dustproof damper with adhesives. (JP '196 pg. 25 paragraph 45) Further, JP '196 teaches that the inner periphery of the dustproof damper is attached with adhesive to the outer periphery of the coil bobbin after flat knit gold threads are soldered on to the coil bobbin. (JP '196 pgs. 24-25 bridging paragraphs 44 and 45)

However, what JP '196, Kimura and/or Sakamoto fails to teach, suggest or disclose is applying a non-conductive adhesive between a woven spider and a coil former before a conductive adhesive has cured to cover the conductive adhesive and join the woven spider and the coil former as described in Claim 33. In the official action, it has apparently been asserted that JP '196 teaches that an adhesive is used to bond the woven spider to the coil former, "which would be prior to the solder being hardened or cured." Applicant respectfully traverses that JP '196, Kimura and/or Sakamoto teaches, suggests, or discloses application of a non-conductive adhesive before a conductive adhesive has cured as described in Claim 33 since there is no support for such an assertion in any of the cited references.

For at least the foregoing reasons, all of the claim features provided in Claims 1, 28 and 33 are not taught or suggested by the cited combination of the prior art. Thus, a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established for Claims 1, 28 and 33. In addition, Claims 28-33 depend from independent Claim 28 and are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests the removal of the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of Claims 1 and 28-33.

so find and issue a Notice of Allowance in due course. Should the Examiner deem a telephone conference to be beneficial in expediting examination and/or allowance of this application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Sanders N. Hillis
Attorney Reg. No. 45,712

SNH/bal

BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE
CUSTOMER NO. 27879
Telephone: (317) 636-0886
Fax: (317) 634-6701